Information Matrix Splitting☆

Shengxin Zhu, Tongxiang Gu, Xingping Liu, Zeyao Mo

Laboratory of Computational Physics,
Institute of Applied Physics and Computational Mathematics,
P.O. Box, 8009, Beijing 100088, P.R China.

arXiv:1605.07646v2 [stat.ME] 5 Sep 2016

Abstract

Efficient statistical estimates via the maximum likelihood method requires the observed information, the negative of the Hessian of the underlying log-likelihood function. Computing the observed information is computationally prohibitive for high-throughput biological data, therefore, the expected information matrix—the Fisher information matrix—is often preferred due to its simplicity. In this paper, we prove that the average of the observed and the Fisher information of restricted/residual log-likelihood functions for linear mixed models can be split into two matrices. The expectation of one part is the Fisher information matrix but enjoys a simper formula than the Fisher information matrix. The other part which involves a lot of computations is a random zero matrix and thus is negligible. Leveraging such a splitting can simplify evaluation of the approximate Hessian of a log-likelihood function.

Keywords: Observed information matrix, Fisher information matrix, Newton method, linear mixed model, variance parameter estimation.
2010 MSC: 65J12, 62P10, 65C60, 65F99

1. Introduction

Many statical methods require an estimation of unknown (co-)variance parameter(s) of a model. The estimation is usually obtained by maximizing a *log-likelihood* (the logarithm of a likelihood function). In principle, one requires the *observed information matrix*—the negative Hessian matrix or the second derivative of the log-likelihood—to obtain an accurate maximum likelihood estimator according to the (exact) Newton method [7], whereas the expected value of the observed information matrix, which is usually referred to as the *Fisher information matrix* or simply the *information matrix* is used instead due to its simplicity[2]. The Fisher information matrix describes the essential information data about unknown parameters and has a simper form than that the observed information matrix (as we shall see in Table 1), Therefore, Fisher information matrix is preferred not only in analyzing the asymptotic behavior of maximum likelihood estimates [1, 19, 20] but also in finding the variance of an estimator and in Bayesian inference [13]. In particular, if the Fisher information matrix is used in the process of a maximum (log-)likelihood method, the resulting algorithm is called the *Fisher-scoring algorithm* [11], which is widely used. Besides the traditional application fields like genetical theory of natural selection and breeding [3], many other fields including theoretical physics have introduced the Fisher information matrix theory [5][6][14][16].

The Fisher scoring algorithm is a success in simplifying the approximation of the Hessian matrix of the log-likelihood. Still, evaluating of the elements of the Fisher information matrix is one of the bottlenecks in a maximizing log-likelihood procedure, which prohibits the Fisher scoring algorithm for large data sets. In particular, the high-throughput technologies in the biological science and engineering means that the size of data sets and the corresponding statistical models have suddenly increased by several orders of magnitude. Further reducing computations

☆The project is supported by the Natural Science Fund of China(NSFC)(grant number 11501044), partially by NSFC(grant number, 11571001, 11571047, 11671049, 11671051, 61672003) and the Laboratory of Computational Physics.
Email address: zhu_shengxin@iapcm.ac.cn (Shengxin Zhu)

is deserved in large scale statistical models like genome-wide association studies which can involves many thousands parameters to be estimated [9, 10, 21, 22].

The aim of this short note is to provide a concise mathematical statement. The statement says that by splitting the average of the observed information matrix and the expected information matrix, a simper approximation to the observed information matrix than the Fisher information matrix exists. Such an approximation significantly reduces computations. The average information idea was first proposed in [8] for (co)variance matrices which linearly depend on variance parameters. It results an efficient breeding algorithm in [4], and followed by [12]. Unfortunately, several recent *Nature* publications [9, 10, 21, 22] on the hot genome-wide association study—a subject closely related to breeding—neglect these formulas according to the limited but essential formulas that they supply, for example [22, eq.7, eq.8]. The results presented here are applicable in (co)-variance parameters estimation with linear mixed models and the mathematical abstraction can shed light on other applications which involve a maximum likelihood estimation.

2. Preliminary

Consider the linear mixed model

$$y = X\tau + Zu + \epsilon, \tag{1}$$

where $y \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times 1}$ is the observation, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times 1}$ is the vector of fixed effects, $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times p}$ is the design matrix which corresponds to the fixed effects, $u \in \mathbb{R}^{b\times 1}$ is the vector of unobserved random effects, $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times b}$ is the design matrix which corresponds to the random effects. $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times 1}$ is the vector of residual errors. The random effects, u, and the residual errors, ϵ, are multivariate normal distributions such that $E(u) = 0$, $E(\epsilon) = 0$, $u \sim N(0, \sigma^2 G)$, $\epsilon \sim N(0, \sigma^2 R)$ and

$$\mathrm{var}\begin{bmatrix} u \\ \epsilon \end{bmatrix} = \sigma^2 \begin{bmatrix} G & 0 \\ 0 & R \end{bmatrix}, \tag{2}$$

where $G \in \mathbb{R}^{b\times b}$, $R \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$. Typically G and R are functions of parameters that need to be estimated, say, $G = G(\gamma)$ and $R = R(\phi)$. Further we denote $\kappa = (\gamma, \phi)$.

Estimating the variance parameters $\theta = (\sigma^2, \kappa)$, requires a conceptually simple nonlinear iterative procedure which can be computationally expensive to carry out. One has to maximize a residual log-likelihood function of the form [15, p.252]

$$\ell_R = \mathrm{const} - \frac{1}{2}\{(n-\nu)\log\sigma^2 + \log\det(H) + \log\det(X^T H^{-1} X) + \frac{y^T P y}{\sigma^2}\}, \tag{3}$$

where $H = R(\phi) + ZG(\gamma)Z^T$, $\nu = \mathrm{rank}(X)$ and

$$P = H^{-1} - H^{-1}X(X^T H^{-1} X)^{-1} X H^{-1}.$$

Here we suppose $\nu = p$. The first derivatives of ℓ_R is referred as the *scores* for the variance parameters $\theta := (\sigma^2, \kappa)^T$ [15, p.252]:

$$s(\sigma^2) = \frac{\partial \ell_R}{\partial \sigma^2} = -\frac{1}{2}\left\{\frac{n-p}{\sigma^2} - \frac{y^T P y}{\sigma^4}\right\}, \tag{4}$$

$$s(\kappa_i) = \frac{\partial \ell_R}{\partial \kappa_i} = -\frac{1}{2}\left\{\mathrm{tr}(P\frac{\partial H}{\partial \kappa_i}) - \frac{1}{\sigma^2} y^T P \frac{\partial H}{\partial \kappa_i} P y\right\}. \tag{5}$$

where $\kappa = (\gamma^T, \phi^T)^T$. We shall denote

$$S(\theta) = (s(\sigma^2), s(\kappa_1), \ldots, s(\kappa_m))^T.$$

The negative of the Hessian of the log-likelihood function is referred to as the *observed information matrix*. We will

Algorithm 1 Newton-Raphson method to solve $S(\theta) = 0$.

1: Give an initial guess of θ_0
2: **for** $k = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$ until convergence **do**
3: Solve $\mathcal{I}_O(\theta_k)\delta_k = S(\theta_k)$,
4: $\theta_{k+1} = \theta_k + \delta_k$
5: **end for**

denote the matrix as $\mathcal{I}_O$.

$$\mathcal{I}_O = -\begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \ell_R}{\partial \sigma^2 \partial \sigma^2} & \frac{\partial \ell_R}{\partial \sigma^2 \partial \kappa_1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial \ell_R}{\partial \sigma^2 \partial \kappa_m} \\ \frac{\partial \ell_R}{\partial \kappa_1 \partial \sigma^2} & \frac{\partial \ell_R}{\partial \kappa_1 \partial \kappa_1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial \ell_R}{\partial \kappa_1 \partial \kappa_m} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial \ell_R}{\partial \kappa_m \partial \sigma^2} & \frac{\partial \ell_R}{\partial \kappa_m \partial \kappa_1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial \ell_R}{\partial \kappa_m \partial \kappa_m} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{6}$$

Given an initial guess of the variance parameter θ_0, a standard approach to maximize ℓ_R or find the roots of the score equations $S(\theta) = 0$ is the Newton-Raphson method (Algorithm 1), which requires elements of the observed information matrix.

For convenience, we list the elements of the observed information matrix in the second column of Table 1. In particular,

$$\mathcal{I}_O(\kappa_i, \kappa_j) = \frac{\mathrm{tr}(P\ddot{H}_{ij}) - \mathrm{tr}(P\dot{H}_i P\dot{H}_j)}{2} + \frac{2y^T P\dot{H}_i P\dot{H}_j Py - y^T P\ddot{H}_{ij} Py}{2\sigma^2}, \tag{7}$$

where $\dot{H}_i = \frac{\partial H}{\partial \kappa_i}$ and $\ddot{H}_{ij} = \frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial \kappa_i \kappa_j}$. Each element $\mathcal{I}_O(\kappa_i, \kappa_j)$ involves two trace terms which involve two/four matrix-matrix products respectively. Evaluating these terms is computationally expensive, which prohibits the practical use of the (exact) Newton method for large data sets.

In practice, the *Fisher information matrix*, $\mathcal{I} = E(\mathcal{I}_O)$, is preferred. The elements of the Fisher information matrix have simper forms than these of the observed information matrix (see column 3 in Table 1). The corresponding algorithm is referred to as the *Fisher scoring algorithm* [11]. Still the element $\mathcal{I}(\kappa_i, \kappa_j)$ of the Fisher information matrix involves the computationally expensive trace terms (see Table 1).

In [4], the authors introduce the *average information matrix* $\mathcal{I}_A$ [4, eq.7](see Table 1). Which is the main part of the average of the observed and expected information matrix. Precisely,

$$\frac{\mathcal{I}(\kappa_i, \kappa_j) + \mathcal{I}_O(\kappa_i, \kappa_j)}{2} = \underbrace{\frac{y^T PH_i PH_j Py}{2\sigma_2}}_{\mathcal{I}_A(\kappa_i, \kappa_j)} + \underbrace{\frac{\mathrm{tr}(PH_{ij}) - y^T PH_{ij} Py/\sigma^2}{4}}_{\hat{\mathcal{I}}_Z(\kappa_i, \kappa_j)}. \tag{8}$$

The authors in [8] introduced the *average information* for a covariance matrix H which linearly depends on the variance parameters, say, $H = \sum_{j=1}^{K} \kappa_i M_i$. In such a case, $H_{ij} = 0$, $\mathcal{I}_A$ is exactly the average of the observed and Fisher information matrix. For more general covariance matrix, a natural explanation comes from the perspective of the classical matrix splitting [17, p.94]. The explanation can be formulated as a general statement:

3. Main result

Theorem 1. *Let $\mathcal{I}_O$ and $\mathcal{I}$ be the observed information matrix and the Fisher information matrix for the residual log-likelihood of linear mixed model respectively, then the average of the observed information matrix and the Fisher information matrix can be split as $\frac{\mathcal{I}_O + \mathcal{I}}{2} = \mathcal{I}_A + I_Z$, such that the expectation of $\mathcal{I}_A$ is the Fisher information matrix and $E(\hat{\mathcal{I}}_Z) = 0$.*

Such a splitting aims to remove computationally expensive and negligible terms so that a Newton-like method is applicable for large data which involves many thousands fixed and random effects. It keeps the essential information in the observed information matrix. In this sense, $\mathcal{I}_A$ is a good approximation which is data-dependent (on y) to the

Table 1: Observed information Splitting table

index	$\mathcal{I}_O$ [15, p.252]	$\mathcal{I}$	$\mathcal{I}_A$ [4]	$\mathcal{I}_F$
(σ^2,σ^2)	$\frac{y^TPy}{\sigma^6}-\frac{n-\nu}{2\sigma^4}$	$\frac{n-\nu}{2\sigma^4}$	$\frac{y^TPy}{2\sigma^6}$	$\frac{y^TPy}{\sigma^6}-\frac{n-\nu}{2\sigma^2}$
(σ^2,κ_i)	$\frac{y^TPH_iPy}{2\sigma^4}$	$\frac{\mathrm{tr}(PH_i)}{2\sigma^2}$	$\frac{y^TPH_iPy}{2\sigma^4}$	$\frac{y^TPH_iPy}{2\sigma^4}$
(κ_i,κ_j)	$\mathcal{I}_O(\kappa_i,\kappa_j)$	$\frac{\mathrm{tr}(PH_iPH_j)}{2}$	$\frac{y^TPH_iPH_jPy}{2\sigma^2}$	$\frac{y^TPH_iPH_jPy}{2\sigma^2}$
	$\mathcal{I}_O(\kappa_i,\kappa_j)=\frac{\mathrm{tr}(PH_{ij})-\mathrm{tr}(PH_iPH_j)}{2}+\frac{2y^TPH_iPH_jPy-y^TPH_{ij}Py}{2\sigma^2}$,			
	$H_i=\frac{\partial H_i}{\partial\kappa_i}$, $H_{ij}=\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial H_i\partial H_j}$			

the data-independent Fisher information. An Quasi-Newton iterative procedure is obtained by replacing $\mathcal{I}_O$ with $\mathcal{I}_A$ in Algorithm 1.

4. Proof of the main result

4.1. Baisic Lemma

Lemma 1. *Let $y\sim N(X\tau,\sigma^2H)$, be a random variable and H is symmetric positive definite matrix,where* $\mathrm{rank}(X)=\nu$*, then*

$$P=H^{-1}-H^{-1}X(X^TH^{-1}X)^{-1}XH^{-1}$$

is a weighted projection matrix such that

1. $PX=0$*;*
2. $PHP=P$*;*
3. $\mathrm{tr}(PH)=n-\nu$*;*
4. $PE(yy^T)=\sigma^2PH$*.*

Proof. The first 2 terms can be verified by directly by computation. Since H is a positive definite matrix, there exist $H^{1/2}$ such that

$$\mathrm{tr}(PH)=\mathrm{tr}(H^{1/2}PH^{1/2})=\mathrm{tr}(I-\hat{X}(\hat{X}^T\hat{X})^{-1}\hat{X})=n-\mathrm{rank}(\hat{X})=n-\nu.$$

where $\hat{X}=H^{-1/2}X$. The 4th item follows because

$$PE(yy^T)=P(\mathrm{var}(y)+X\tau(X\tau)^T)=\sigma^2PH+PX\tau(X\tau)^T=\sigma^2PH.$$

□

Lemma 2. *Let H be a parametric matrix of κ, and X be an constant matrix, then the partial derivative of the projection matrix*

$$P=H^{-1}-H^{-1}X(X^TH^{-1}X)^{-1}XH^{-1}$$

with respect to κ_i is $\dot{P}_i=-P\dot{H}_iP$, where $\dot{P}_i=\frac{\partial P}{\partial\kappa_i}$ and $\dot{H}_i=\frac{\partial H}{\partial\kappa_i}$.

Proof. Using the derivatives of the inverse of a matrix

$$\frac{\partial A^{-1}}{\partial\kappa_i}=-A^{-1}\frac{\partial A}{\partial\kappa_i}A^{-1}.$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{P}_i =& \frac{\partial}{\partial \kappa_i}(H^{-1} - H^{-1}X(X^TH^{-1}X)^{-1}X^TH^{-1})\\ =& -H^{-1}\dot{H}_iH^{-1} + H^{-1}\dot{H}_iH^{-1}X(X^TH^{-1}X)^{-1}X^TH^{-1}\\ & - H^{-1}X(X^TH^{-1}X)^{-1}X^TH^{-1}\dot{H}_iH^{-1}X(X^TH^{-1}X)^{-1}X^TH^{-1}\\ & + H^{-1}X(X^TH^{-1}X)^{-1}X^TH^{-1}\dot{H}_iH^{-1}\\ =& -H^{-1}\dot{H}_i + H^{-1}X(X^TH^{-1}X)^{-1}X^TH^{-1}\dot{H}_iP = -P\dot{H}_iP.\end{aligned}$$

□

4.2. Formulae of the observed information matrix

Lemma 3. *The element of the observed information matrix for the residual log-likelihood* (3) *is given by*

$$\mathcal{I}_O(\sigma^2,\sigma^2) = \frac{y^TPy}{\sigma^6} - \frac{n-p}{2\sigma^4}, \tag{9}$$

$$\mathcal{I}_O(\sigma^2,\kappa_i) = \frac{1}{2\sigma^4}y^TP\dot{H}_iPy, \tag{10}$$

$$\mathcal{I}_O(\kappa_i,\kappa_j) = \frac{1}{2}\left\{\mathrm{tr}(P\dot{H}_{ij}) - \mathrm{tr}(P\dot{H}_iP\dot{H}_j)\right\} + \frac{1}{2\sigma^2}\left\{2y^TP\dot{H}_iP\dot{H}_jPy - y^TP\ddot{H}_{ij}Py\right\}. \tag{11}$$

where $\dot{H}_i = \frac{\partial H}{\partial \kappa_i}$, $\ddot{H}_{ij} = \frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial K_i \partial K_j}$.

Proof. The result in (9) is standard according to the definition. The result in (10) follows use the result in Lemma 2 if one uses the score in (4). The first term in (11) follows because

$$\frac{\partial\,\mathrm{tr}(P\dot{H}_i)}{\partial \kappa_j} = tr(P\ddot{H}_{ij}) + \mathrm{tr}(\dot{P}_j\dot{H}_i) = \mathrm{tr}(P\ddot{H}_{ij}) - \mathrm{tr}(P\dot{H}_jP\dot{H}_i) \quad (\dot{P}_j = -PH_jP).$$

The second term in (11) follows because Employ the the result in Lemma 2, we have

$$-\frac{\partial(P\dot{H}_iP)}{\partial \kappa_j} = P\dot{H}_jP\dot{H}_iP - P\ddot{H}_{ij}P + P\dot{H}_iP\dot{H}_jP. \tag{12}$$

Further note that $\dot{H}_i$, $\dot{H}_j$ and P are symmetric. The second term in (11) follows because of

$$y^TP\dot{H}_iP\dot{H}_jPy = y^TP\dot{H}_jP\dot{H}_iPy.$$

□

4.3. Formulae of the Fisher information matrix

The *Fisher information matrix*, $\mathcal{I}$, is the expect value of the observed information matrix, $\mathcal{I} = E(\mathcal{I}_O)$. The Fisher information matrix enjoys a simpler formula than the observed information matrix and provides the essential information provided by the data, and thus it is a nature approximation to the negative Jacobian matrix.

Lemma 4. *The element of the Fisher information matrix for the residual log-likelihood function in* (3) *is given by*

$$\mathcal{I}(\sigma^2,\sigma^2) = E(\mathcal{I}_O(\sigma^2,\sigma^2)) = \frac{\mathrm{tr}(PH)}{2\sigma^4} = \frac{n-\nu}{2\sigma^4}, \tag{13}$$

$$\mathcal{I}(\sigma^2,\kappa_i) = E(\mathcal{I}_O(\sigma^2,\kappa_i)) = \frac{1}{2\sigma^2}\,\mathrm{tr}(P\dot{H}_i), \tag{14}$$

$$\mathcal{I}(\kappa_i,\kappa_j) = E(\mathcal{I}_O(\kappa_i,\kappa_j)) = \frac{1}{2}\,\mathrm{tr}(P\dot{H}_iP\dot{H}_j). \tag{15}$$

Proof. The formulas can be found in [15]. Here we supply alternative proof. First note that $PX = 0$ and

$$PE(yy^T) = P(\sigma^2H - X\tau(X\tau)^T) = \sigma^2PH. \tag{16}$$

Then

$$E(y^TPy) = E(\mathrm{tr}(Pyy^T)) = \mathrm{tr}(PE(yy^T)) = \sigma^2\,\mathrm{tr}(PH) = (n-\nu)\sigma^2. \tag{17}$$

where $\mathrm{rank}(L_2) = n - \mathrm{rank}(X)$ due to $L_2^TX = 0$. Therefore

$$E(\mathcal{I}_O(\sigma^2,\sigma^2)) = \frac{E(y^TPy)}{\sigma^6} - \frac{n-\nu}{2\sigma^4} = \frac{n-\nu}{2\sigma^4}. \tag{18}$$

Second, we notice that $PHP = P$. Apply the procedure in (17), we have

$$E(y^TP\dot{H}_iPy) = \mathrm{tr}(P\dot{H}_iPE(yy^T)) = \sigma^2\,\mathrm{tr}(P\dot{H}_iPH) = \sigma^2\,\mathrm{tr}(PHP\dot{H}_i) = \sigma^2\,\mathrm{tr}(P\dot{H}_i), \tag{19}$$

$$E(y^TP\dot{H}_iP\dot{H}_jPy) = \sigma^2\,\mathrm{tr}(P\dot{H}_iP\dot{H}_jPH) = \sigma^2\,\mathrm{tr}(PHP\dot{H}_iP\dot{H}_j) = \sigma^2\,\mathrm{tr}(P\dot{H}_iP\dot{H}_j), \tag{20}$$

$$E(y^TP\ddot{H}_{ij}Py) = \sigma^2\,\mathrm{tr}(P\ddot{H}_{ij}PH) = \sigma^2\,\mathrm{tr}(P\ddot{H}_{ij}). \tag{21}$$

Substitute (19) into (10), we obtain (14). Substitute (20) and (21) to (11), we obtain (15). □

Using the Fishing information matrix as an approximate to the negative Jacobian result in the widely used Fisher-scoring algorithm [11].

4.4. Proof of the main result

Proof. Let

$$\mathcal{I}_A(\sigma^2,\sigma^2) = \frac{1}{2\sigma^6}y^TPy; \tag{22}$$

$$\mathcal{I}_A(\sigma^2,\kappa_i) = \frac{1}{2\sigma^4}y^TP\dot{H}_iPy; \tag{23}$$

$$\mathcal{I}_A(\kappa_i,\kappa_j) = \frac{1}{2\sigma^2}y^TP\dot{H}_iP\dot{H}_jPy; \tag{24}$$

then we have

$$I_Z(\sigma^2,\sigma^2) = 0, \tag{25}$$

$$I_Z(\sigma^2,\kappa_i) = \frac{tr(P\dot{H}_i)}{4\sigma^2} - \frac{y^TP\dot{H}_iPy}{4\sigma^4}, \tag{26}$$

$$I_Z(\kappa_i,\kappa_j) = \frac{\mathrm{tr}(P\ddot{H}_{ij}) - y^TP\ddot{H}_{ij}Py/\sigma^2,}{4} \tag{27}$$

Apply the result in (17), we have

$$E(\mathcal{I}_A(\sigma^2,\sigma_2)) = \frac{(n-\nu)}{2\sigma^4} = \mathcal{I}(\sigma^2,\sigma^2). \tag{28}$$

Apply the result in (19), we have

$$E(\mathcal{I}_A(\sigma^2, \kappa_i)) = \frac{\mathrm{tr}(P\dot{H}_i)}{2\sigma^2} \text{ and } E(I_Z(\sigma^2, \kappa_i)) = 0. \tag{29}$$

Apply the result in (20), we have

$$E(\mathcal{I}_A(\kappa_i, \kappa_j)) = \frac{\mathrm{tr}(P\dot{H}_i P H_j)}{2} = I(\kappa_i, \kappa_j) \tag{30}$$

and $E(\mathcal{I}_Z(\kappa_i, \kappa_j)) = 0$.

□

5. Discussion

Compare $\mathcal{I}_A$ with $\mathcal{I}_O$, and $\mathcal{I}_F$ in Table 1, in contrast with $\mathcal{I}_O(\kappa_i, \kappa_j)$ which involves 4 matrix-matrix products, The counter part of the negative of approximated Jacobian only involves a quadratic term, which can be evaluated by four matrix-vector multiplications and an inner product as in Algorithm 2. This is an essential approximation technique which significantly reduces computations. As for the matrix vector multiplication Py which involves the inverse of the H. It can be further reduced computation by certain matrix transform $Py = R^{-1}e$ [23, Thm 6], where e is the fitted residual $e = y - X\hat{\tau} - Z\tilde{u}$, $\hat{\tau}$ and $\tilde{u}$ is the solution to the following mixed model equations

$$\begin{pmatrix} X^T R^{-1} X & X^T R^{-1} Z \\ Z^T R^{-1} X & Z^T R^{-1} Z + G^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\tau} \\ \tilde{u} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} X^T R^{-1} y \\ Z^T R^{-1} y \end{pmatrix}. \tag{31}$$

Notice that the observations is often greater than the number of fixed and random effects, say $n > p + b$. Therefore, one can simply evaluated the weighted residual $R^{-1}e$, instead of computing the matrix vector multiplication $Py = (H^{-1} - H^{-1}X(X^T H^{-1} X)^{-1} X H^{-1})y$ directly. The reader is directed to [23] for more details. Finally the averaged information matrix splitting together with an efficient sparse solver make derivative Newton method applicable for high-throughout biological data analytic[18, 24].

Algorithm 2 Compute $\mathcal{I}_A(\kappa_i, \kappa_j) = \frac{y^T P\dot{H}_i P\dot{H}_j Py}{2\sigma_2}$

1: $\xi = Py$
2: $\eta_i = H_i\xi$; $\eta_j = H_j\xi$;
3: $\zeta = P\eta_j$
4: $\mathcal{I}_A(\kappa_i, \kappa_j) = \frac{\eta_i^T \xi}{2\sigma^2}$

Acknowledgement

The first author would like to thank Dr Sue Welham at VSNi Ltd and Professor Robin Thompson at Rothamsted Research and for introducing him the restricted maximum likelihood method.

Reference

References

[1] Edgeworth and R.A. Fisher. On the efficiency of maximum likelihood estimation. *Annals of Statistics*, 4(3):501–514, 1976.

[2] B Efron and D.V. Hinkley. Assessing the accurancy of the maximum likelihood estimator:observed verus expected fisher information. *Bimetrika*, 65(3):457–478, 1978.

[3] R.A. Fisher. *The Genetical Theory of Natural Selection*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1930.

[4] Arthur R. Gilmour, Robin Thompson, and Brian R. Cullis. Average information reml: An efficient algorithm for variance parameter estimation in linear mixed models. *Biometrics*, 51(4):pp. 1440–1450, 1995.

[5] A. F. Heavens, M. Seikel, B.D. Nord, M. Aich, and Y. Bouffanais. Generalised fisher matrices. *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, (arXiv:1404.2854v2), 2014.
[6] W. Janke, D. A. Johnston, and R. Kenna. Information geometry and transitions. *Physica A*, 336(1-2):181, 2004.
[7] Robert I Jennrich and PF Sampson. Newton-Raphson and related algorithms for maximum likelihood variance component estimation. *Technometrics*, 18(1):11–17, 1976.
[8] DL Johnson and R Thompson. Restricted maximum likelihood estimation of variance components for univariate animal models using sparse matrix techniques and average information. *Journal of dairy science*, 78(2):449–456, 1995.
[9] Christoph Lippert, Jennifer Listgarten, Ying Liu, Carl M Kadie, Robert I Davidson, and David Heckerman. Fast linear mixed models for genome-wide association studies. *Nature Methods*, 8(10):833–835, 2011.
[10] Jennifer Listgarten, Christoph Lippert, Carl M Kadie, Robert I Davidson, Eleazar Eskin, and David Heckerman. Improved linear mixed models for genome-wide association studies. *Nature methods*, 9(6):525–526, 2012.
[11] N.T. Longford. A fast scoring algorithm for maximum likelihood estimation in unbalanced mixed models with nested random effects. *Bimetrika*, 4(817-827), 1987.
[12] Karin Meyer. An average information restricted maximum likelihood algorithm for estimating reduced rank genetic covairance matrices or covariance functions for animal models with equal design matrices. *Genetics Selection Evolution*, 29:97–116, 1997.
[13] J.I. Myung and D.J. Navarro. *Encyclopedia of Behavioral Statistics*, chapter Information matrix. 2004.
[14] M. Prokopenkon, J.T. Lizier, O. Obst, and X.R. Wang. Relating fisher information to order parameters. *Physical Review E*, 84(4), 2011.
[15] Shayle R. Searle, George Casella, and Charles E. McCulloch. *Variance components*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. Wiley-Interscience [John Wiley & Sons], Hoboken, NJ, 2006. Reprint of the 1992 original, Wiley-Interscience Paperback Series.
[16] M Vallisneri. A user manual for the Fisher informaiton matrix. Technical report, California Institute of Technology, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, 2007.
[17] R.S. Varga. *Matrix Iterative Analysis*. Springer-Verlag.
[18] S. Sue Welham, Shengxin Zhu, and Andrew J. Wathen. Big data, fast models: faster calculation of models from high-throughput biological data sets. Knowledge transfer Project Report IP12-0009, Smith Institute, The Universtiy of Oxford, Oxford, Nov. 2013.
[19] R Zamir. A necessary and sufficient condition for equality in the matrix fisher information inequality. Technical report, Tel Aviv University.
[20] R Zamir. A proof of the fisher information inequality via a data processing argument. *IEEE Transation on Information Theory*, 44:1246–1250, 1998.
[21] Zhiwu Zhang, Elhan Ersoz, Chao-Qiang Lai, Rory J Todhunter, Hemant K Tiwari, Michael A Gore, Peter J Bradbury, Jianming Yu, Donna K Arnett, Jose M Ordovas, et al. Mixed linear model approach adapted for genome-wide association studies. *Nature genetics*, 42(4):355–360, 2010.
[22] Xiang Zhou and Matthew Stephens. Genome-wide efficient mixed-model analysis for association studies. *Nature genetics*, 44(7):821–824, 2012.
[23] Shengxin Zhu. Computing log likelihood and its derivatives for restricted maximum likelihood method. Technical Report arXiv:1608.07207v1, IAPCM.
[24] Shengxin Zhu, Tongxiang Gu, Xiaowen Xu, and Zeyao Mo. Information splitting for big data analytics. In *Proceding of Cyber2016*. IEEE, 2016.